

**MINUTES**  
**SCOTTSDALE CITY COUNCIL**  
**SPECIAL MEETING**  
**Tuesday, February 25, 2003**

**The Kiva  
City Hall  
Scottsdale, Arizona**

**MINUTES  
SCOTTSDALE CITY COUNCIL  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
Tuesday, February 25, 2003**

**CALL TO ORDER (IN CITY HALL KIVA FORUM)**

Mayor Manross called to order the Special Meeting of the Scottsdale City Council on Tuesday, February 25, 2003 in the Kiva, City Hall, at 5:05 P.M.

**ROLL CALL**

Present:

Mayor Mary Manross  
Vice Mayor Ned O'Hearn  
Council Members David Ortega, Tom Silverman, Robert Littlefield,  
Wayne Ecton, and Cynthia Lukas

Also Present:

City Manager Jan Dolan  
City Attorney David Pennartz  
City Clerk Sonia Robertson

**Information Update**

Overview of transit policy issues, including steps the Transportation Department is taking to improve efficiencies in response to anticipated budget shortfalls.

This update was presented as part of staff's presentation for the agenda items.

**Public Comment**

**Nick Luongo**, 9542 E. Rockwood Drive, expressed concern over safety and noise issues associated with the Scottsdale Airport. He questioned why these problems haven't been adequately addressed thus far.

**REGULAR AGENDA      ITEMS 1 - 6**

John Little presented an all inclusive slide presentation to introduce all of tonight's agenda items for discussion. His presentation and comments have been outlined below.

Mr. Little began by stressing that there would be no decision made tonight about light rail in the city. He pointed out that staff meets with Council annually for direction in addressing key issues as they relate to transit. Two years ago, Council provided policy direction indicating that the city's bus service should be roughly comparable to Phoenix and Tempe's service. Last year, staff received direction from Council as staff presented a draft Transit Plan. Council felt it was very important to take the draft plan into the community and acquire public input. Once that was completed, staff was to present a complete plan to Council that represented citizen input and update Council on the first phase of the investment study. This year, staff is returning with the Transit Plan that not only looks to the future, but is well grounded in the economic constraints the city faces today.

## **Transit in Scottsdale Objectives for Tonight's Meeting**

- Policies and Strategies
- Transit Plan
- Rapid Transit Study
- FY 04 Budget
- Business Items
- Intergovernmental Agreements

## **General Plan Community Mobility Element**

- Approved by Voters in 2001
- Goal: Safe, Efficient, Accessible Choices for Getting Around
- Encourages Regional/Local Transit Connections

GP is a primary tool for guiding the future development of Scottsdale

Describes long term goals for land use, housing, neighborhoods and transportation

Includes policies to guide day-to-day decision making

Community Mobility Element policies concentrate on providing safe, efficient, accessible choices for moving people, goods and information

Recognizes Scottsdale as an auto-oriented community, but that we need additional choices to preserve our quality of life

Specific strategies include:

- Seeking opportunities for alternate modes of transportation
- Improving regional transit connections
- Encouraging trip reduction and telecommuting as a means to reduce or shorten auto trips
- Encouraging partnerships between citizens, government and businesses to reduce peak hour traffic congestion
- Preserve long range planning opportunities for rapid transit

## **General Plan Transit-Related Goals**

- Regional Connections
- Management
- Economic Vitality
- Air Quality

Travel distances are increasing. Residents live, work and play in differing parts of the Valley.

The importance of maintaining our regional connections will increase as activity centers continue to pop up throughout the Valley.

Transit---not just buses, but trip reduction strategies such a telecommuting, will help to minimize traffic volumes, especially during peak hours when our streets are at its busiest.

Scottsdale is a net importer of jobs. More people work in Scottsdale than live here. Further, we know that many of the workers come into Scottsdale---especially those in the service industry---are coming from specific areas of Phoenix and Mesa. Many employers rely on transit as a means to attract workers to jobs.

Many can argue the effectiveness of transit in reducing the impacts of our brown cloud. What IS clear, however, is that many strategies---including transit----can combine to make a difference in the quality of the air we breathe

According to MAG projections, 2000 PM Peak Hour level of service at key valley intersections indicates that they area operating at a LOS (Level of Service) rated as E or F which is considered unacceptable.

By 2020, we see the effects of an increasing population and an increasing willingness to travel longer to get to where we want to go. The number of poorly performing intersections expands from the core to include almost the entire area inside the Loop 101.

By 2030, the valley population is projected to be over 6 million people; therefore, we see even more intersections tangled in traffic. These projections show that we cannot continue to rely upon our current transportation plans to forestall this inevitable congestion. A combination of solutions, including transit, will be needed to help us manage the growing demand that will be placed on our transportation network.

#### --Transit Coverage

East-West (Phoenix)

North-South (Valley Metro)

Generally, access to our east west bus routes is purchased from the city of Phoenix, our north-south routes are purchased via intergovernmental agreement from Valley Metro, or RPTA.

The city provides transit services to its seniors and people with disabilities through dial a ride and two special programs developed by Scottsdale: Cab Connection (a taxi voucher program) and TRIP (a mileage reimbursement program).

The city also provides specialty theme transit service such as the downtown trolley (we are in the process of purchasing 7 new vehicles that will circulate through out our shopping districts.) and the Giants baseball shuttle, which brings baseball fans from remote parking areas to the stadium.

#### **Current Transit System Owned Capital and Purchased Service**

- Capital: Buses, Transit Center, etc.
- Service: Regional Partnerships
- IGA City of Phoenix
- IGA Valley Metro
- IGA Maricopa County
- Contract Directly with Providers
- Downtown Trolley
- Giants Baseball Shuttle

Scottsdale purchases much of its transit service----dial a ride, regular bus service through intergovernmental agreements with the City of Phoenix and Valley Metro. The specific routes are identified in each of the council actions.

Explain timing of IGAs, some of the things that influence costs (annual contract adjustments, insurance costs, effects of unionization...)

Scottsdale has partnered with Maricopa County to provide its share of Special Transportation Services---for those who are unable to use dial a ride. These trips are often made by dialysis patients who are too frail to use DAR. Scottsdale citizens generate about 350 trips per month using this service.

The city also directly contracts for specialty theme service such as our downtown trolley and the giants baseball shuttle. Both of these contracts are scheduled to be re-procured in FY04.

### **How We Monitor Performance**

- Efficiency

  - Cost per Passenger Trip

- Effectiveness

  - Passengers per Mile

  - Passengers per Hour

- Capacity of System Used

Important to return value for each dollar spent on transit

The transit plan sets performance standards for each of the types of service

Receive data each month---monitor, analyze and, if necessary, adjust

Also conduct surveys to gather intelligence about satisfaction levels

“Why are the Buses Empty?” It may be out of service and heading toward the maintenance facility, it may be the end of the route (very likely---a lot of routes terminate in Scottsdale) or it may be the last route of the day.

Highest performing routes tend to be regional routes that connect many activity centers and bring workers into Scottsdale from other parts of the Valley (we are a net importer of jobs).

Lowest performing routes tend to be those that circulate entirely within Scottsdale, but connect important facilities such as the Mayo Clinic, libraries and senior centers.

### **Trends**

- Growth in Ridership

- Increased Demand for Trolley Service

- Popularity of Cab Connection

- DAR Costs are Flattening

- Other Transit Costs Increasing

Approximately 1.8 million people boarded a bus in the city of Scottsdale in 2002. We are seeing increases in ridership especially on our regional routes and on our downtown trolley. We are

currently looking at our trolley route to find ways to improve upon how visitors may circulate throughout downtown.

Popularity in Cab Connection continues to grow----over 1500 seniors and people with disabilities are enrolled in program. We regularly receive comments from seniors who are grateful for this more effective alternative to dial a ride. Has translated into a virtual elimination of complaints about DAR. Happily for the city, it has also led to a shift in demand----more people are moving from DAR to Cab Connection, resulting in a reduction in the growth in costs.

Unfortunately, overall transit costs are continuing to increase. As mentioned earlier, Some of these increases are beyond our control---contract costs that have built-in escalation clauses, increasing insurance costs, etc.

We continue to work with our colleagues in Phoenix and Valley Metro to find ways to minimize our costs.

#### **Total Cost of Operating Transit in Scottsdale: FY03**

- Fares 10%
- City Resources
- State Shared Revenues 55%
- General Fund 25%
- Federal Transit Administration 2%
- RPTA 8%

Fares are collected from passengers who use the transit system. Fares vary according to type and whether they are purchased individually or as passes. Fares account for about 15% of gross operating costs. Generally, longer regional routes tend to have higher farebox returns than shorter local routes.

The city funds its transit system through its allocation of state shared revenues (Auto in Lieu---from vehicle license taxes) and Local Transportation Assistance Fund (from the AZ Lottery).

The city also uses a portion of its general funds (about \$4 million in FY 03) to support transit services

The RPTA funds a portion of route 72 in Scottsdale using a share of its RARF funds.

The FTA is providing a diminishing source of support for transit operations---shifting its emphasis to capital projects. (The regional maintenance facility---of which Scottsdale is a partner---obviates the need for funding the capital cost of contracts)

#### **Distribution of transit operating (not capital) expenditures...**

Most expenditures directed the fixed route service. That's where the bulk of the ridership is and how most workers using the system get to work.

Seventeen percent spent on DAR, Cab Connection and TRIP. Have begun to see DAR costs begin to flatten out, in part due to the success of Cab Connection and TRIP

Note that the 5% spent on marketing represents our contribution to regional customer services: the Bus Book, a bilingual hot line, maintenance of the website and regional transit promotions.

At this time, no funds are being spent to market transit directly in Scottsdale.

## **FY 04 Budget Projections**

- Revenue Projections Lower
- Impact on Transit Service
- Objectives for FY 04

### **Transit Plan Deliverables**

“Scottsdale-Sized”

Demand-Driven

Focus service south of Loop 101

Established Performance Standards

Emphasis on Marketing

Coordination of Land Use & Transit

Maximize Outside Funding Sources

Preserve future rapid transit options

- Recognizes importance of maintaining low-density, unique character of Scottsdale.
- Recognizes automobiles as dominant, desired mode of travel. Recognizes that larger buses will operate on our regional streets and that any neighborhood circulators will use smaller scaled vehicles.
- Recognizes that any transit service improvements will be demand-driven, in other words, there must exist a reasonable demand for that service, it must be developed in partnership with neighborhoods and it must perform up to established performance standards.
- Recommends that transit service be focused on activity centers, employment cores south of the Loop 101. This is where most of the traffic is generated, this is where transit routes will best perform.
- Transit plan contains strategies for ensuring that land use decisions include consideration for pedestrian connections and bus stops.
- It's important that we find ways to spend federal or regional dollars before we spend local funds. Consistent with this plan, we are actively participating in the regional dialogue regarding the extension of the freeway tax to include not only important city street projects but also a greater allocation for transit as well.
- Lastly, it's important that we continue to think beyond the next five years and plan for how we might get around when we are a valley of 6 million people in 2020. To that end, you will hear, in just a moment, about our recommendations from our rapid transit study.

### **Scottsdale/Tempe Rapid Transit Study**

Long Range Planning Study

Partnership with Tempe, MAG, Valley Metro

Regional Connections

Preserve Future Rapid Transit Options

Preserve Federal Funding Opportunities

Purpose of this study was to look at the feasibility of a rapid transit solution as a way dealing with growing traffic congestion. It is a planning document that looks well into the future. The planning horizon for these types of projects can be ten to twenty years.

This study was conducted in partnership with Tempe, MAG and Valley Metro. It explored the potential benefit for establishing a connection to the regional light rail system.

Both the Tempe and Scottsdale Transportation Commissions met in November to consider the results of this study. Both commissions agreed that Scottsdale Road made the most sense as a future rapid transit corridor (downtown, medical campus, Los Arcos, resorts). They also agreed to delay on a recommendation as to whether the technology should be light rail, bus rapid transit or streetcars. Indeed, such a recommendation isn't really needed to preserve our options for the future. By identifying Scottsdale Road as a candidate for a possible rapid transit corridor, we preserve our opportunities to pursue federal funding for such a project (which can pay for up to half the cost of the project)

#### **Action Items**

- Acceptance of the Scottsdale Transit Plan
- Scottsdale Road as a preferred corridor in MAG's Long Range Transportation Plan
- Consider Approval of IGAs (Intergovernmental Agreement)
- City of Phoenix: Transit Service
- Valley Metro: Transit Service
- Valley Metro: Dial a Ride
- Maricopa County: Special Transportation Services

\*\*\*\*\*

Mayor Manross pointed out that the IGAs being considered for approval tonight are IGAs that are currently in existence. The request is for Council to consider renewing the agreements.

**Darlene Petersen**, 7327 E. Wilshire Drive, stated her opinion that the city should dump the Rapid Transit Rail System down Scottsdale Road. She pointed out that the city must consider the type of character it wants to maintain in Scottsdale. The system would be disruptive for businesses, costly, and be a waste of time. She felt that if the city has the money for the light rail system, then it should add more buses.

**Michael Brady**, 8207 E. Jackrabbit Road, explained that he uses the bus system to travel to work, to school, and home again. He acknowledged that cutbacks may be necessary; however, he stated that he hated to see it happen since it would force people to drive automobiles. He stated his support of a light rail system in the city since he felt people would use the system.

**David Bentler**, 2539 N. Miller Road, urged Council's support for the MIS study. He stated his support of the Scottsdale Road corridor for light rail since it would be a great boost for the city. He pointed out that the system would be a great connector to other cities. He explained that he has seen a light rail system energize other communities. He urged Council to keep their options open.

**Tom Mason**, 6164 Colle Comeliz, suggested that if the city proceeds with a light rail system, it should run along the 101 freeway. He also stated his belief that, considering the poor economic times, proceeding with such a system at this time would be irresponsible. He urged Council to say no to the possibility of light rail.



**Sam West**, 8160 N. Hayden, J-210, suggested that to create a linear corridor along Scottsdale Road for a light rail system would “fly in the face of reality”. He explained that a system that would travel from point to point would force people to use those points to use the system. He felt economic realities would prohibit people from using the system due to the extra time involved. He encouraged Council to drop the entire issue of adding a light rail system in the city.

Mayor Manross closed public testimony.

Councilman Silverman stated his understanding of the budget restraints but questioned if reducing the frequency of the buses would reduce ridership. Mr. Little agreed that adding frequency does increase ridership. The reductions would be in areas where demand is low. He stated his belief that the system can continue to serve the areas without impacting ridership since the demand in some areas is low.

Councilman Silverman commended the Transportation Department for their efforts in adding bus shelters and benches within the city. He noted that approximately 100 stops still need attention. He stressed that this is a very important element for people especially in this climate. Mr. Little added that bus shelters are not only important amenities, but are also an important part of marketing.

Councilman Silverman requested that the city look into placing bus schedules in all the city bus shelters for convenience.

Councilman Ecton stated his belief that bus shelters and benches are critical. He stated his belief that the city will be considering adding 24 additional shelters that have been specially designed to reflect the character of Scottsdale. He suggested that the city look at a different solution at the moment since the design being considered would run approximately \$1 million for 24 shelters. He suggested that the price be reduced through alternate design so the funds would stretch further for additional shelters.

Councilman Ecton expressed concern that, by leaving the door open for light rail, the city would be committing themselves to spending more money on studying it. He suggested that the city has a good opportunity to reduce the costs associated with the city’s bus system by fostering cooperation and participation from the city’s major employers. He explained his belief that the city must also consider eliminating bus routes where ridership is low. He questioned if the city is considering increasing fares also. He stated that the city’s Transit Plan should include a plan to provide bus service to the northern part of the city as well as the southern part.

Mayor Manross acknowledged that the city is working on improving its bus service; however, felt there is still a long way to go. She noted that the city is trying to reach the northern part of the city, although currently, the majority of the city’s population is below the CAP. She explained that it makes sense to address those needs first with the city’s limited resources.

In response to a request from Mayor Manross, Ms. Dolan addressed the shelter design issue. The city has gone from a basic shelter design, which did not meet the city’s needs, to one that has a lot of positive features from a ridership standpoint. She explained that she has directed staff to incorporate the positive features of the new design and create a design that would be more cost effective. She noted that due to Federal funding, the city is required to comply with the Davis-Bacon Act requirements.

In response to a request from Councilwoman Lukas, Mr. Little explained that there are ongoing conversations in the valley regarding the possibility of adjusting fares for different routes. Fares, like everything else, are a reflection of the cost for providing the service. As the cost increases, the fares should proportionally increase. The fares are reviewed annually during the city’s budget process.

Mr. Little estimated that the city resources identified in the presentation as State shared revenues would remain intact. He anticipated that the one-half cent sales tax would be looked at for future transit needs. The current tax was instituted in 1985 and expires in 2005. He explained that there is an ongoing regional effort to determine what type of split should be implemented between transit and building roads should the tax continue.

Councilwoman Lukas requested that Mr. Little clarify one of the policy statements for the Transit Plan. Mr. Little explained that when the city considers reducing a service, factors beside costs would need to be reviewed. He explained that the community mobility element of the plan is about providing people in the community with choices. The city would not want to eliminate a choice that would have a severe impact on people's ability to earn a livelihood or acquire medical care. Therefore, productivity must be balanced with the notion that people should have choices about their mobility needs.

Councilwoman Lukas explained that she has been very excited about the Cab Connection Program all along and felt it is an excellent service for seniors and people with disabilities. She questioned how the city is proposing to expand the program. Mr. Little explained that one of the ways to expand the service is to continue to transition people off of the Dial-A-Ride service into the Cab Connection as a cost effective way of expanding the service. He pointed out that this tact would also increase the level of service for the people who need the Dial-A-Ride service due to disabilities. He noted that the city has not done any marketing on the Cab Connection Program. He explained that a more aggressive outreach program would potentially expand the program significantly over the course of the next two or three years.

Michele Korf summarized for Councilwoman Lukas the process that was followed in determining that Scottsdale Road would be the best route to place a light rail system in the community. She explained that destinations, activity centers, etc. were used to determine the proposed route. The criteria indicated that Scottsdale Road made the most sense in that it connects to the regional system as well as connects to the downtown area, the Los Arcos site, etc. She explained that the character of the downtown area received quite a bit of discussion; therefore, the corridor through the downtown area was not identified.

Councilman Ortega noted that seniors comprise 17% of the city's population. Approximately 9,000 of the 36,000 seniors in the city live alone. He pointed out that the seniors account for the majority of people who use the Dial-A-Ride Program. He explained that the Dial-A-Ride Program is twice as expensive as the Taxi Voucher Program.

Councilman Ortega explained that another group who uses the city's mass transit system is comprised of teenagers who are not old enough to drive. He stated that he had suggested that the city partner with the schools to sponsor certain days per week that teenagers could ride free or at reduced rates to certain destinations. He felt this would help increase ridership as the teenagers grew into adults.

Mayor Manross explained her belief that the idea of partnering with various schools on such a program could save the district an enormous amount of money. She felt the city should pursue the idea since the school districts are also in dire need of funding.

Councilman O'Hearn explained that transportation is difficult to predict since it is a moving target. He requested additional information or comments regarding the volatility of long-range revenue sources. Mr. Little explained that he would not characterize the funding sources for transit programs as at risk or as being volatile. He stated that transit is an expensive program that communities offer so the city must continue to plan for the future as the population of the area grows.

Councilman O'Hearn pointed out the disparity of costs associated with the different bus routes according to the information in Council's packet. Mr. Little explained that one of the standards for the system is for each bus to carry a minimum of 1.8 passengers per mile. Presently, there are four routes that exceed that goal, while there are a number of routes that don't meet it. The routes that aren't meeting the goal are reviewed to ensure that there is demand for the service.

Councilman O'Hearn expressed his belief that the BRW Transit Study doesn't incorporate the character and ideals of Scottsdale. He assured everyone that by simply talking about mass transit, light rail wouldn't necessarily be the technology used. Mr. Little explained that the public timetable for the decisions about light rail would most likely coincide with the build out of the light rail system in Phoenix. Ms. Korf clarified that it would be at Council's discretion as to whether or not the city takes the next step. The next logical step would be environment work, although there is no budget for it at the present time.

Mr. Little confirmed for Councilman Littlefield that the city contracts its bus services; therefore, there are constraints due to connectivity issues.

Councilman Littlefield agreed that functionality is more important than form. A reduction in cost would allow the city to place more bus shelters where needed. He explained his belief that Council is making a decision on item number 2 since it specifies that Scottsdale Road would be designated as the locally preferred alignment. He expressed his belief that the mass transit system should not be placed along Scottsdale Road; therefore, he would not support item 2.

Mr. Little explained that item 2 would simply be saying that Scottsdale Road could serve as the corridor for some type of mass transit. By identifying the corridor, the MIS helps guide the city's planning in terms of land use. He noted that the city wouldn't be making a decision tonight that the Council couldn't reverse at a later time as it relates to Scottsdale Road accommodating future rapid transit. It preserves the corridor as a potential preferred corridor but does not lock the city into anything.

Mayor Manross stated her belief that item number 2 would help the city keep their options open over the next few decades. She didn't feel the city should eliminate its options for the future. She explained that the constituents would vote on any rapid transit system. She also reminded everyone that the issue of extending the city's current transportation tax would be on the ballot in 2004.

Mr. Little confirmed that approval of item 2 would simply keep the door open for Federal funds in order to help finance a rapid transit system that would connect to the other communities.

Councilman Ortega noted that the spine of a rapid transit system must be located where the jobs are, where the commerce is, and where accessibility is. He explained that the plan indicates utilization of the couplet, which is designed to handle the traffic.

Councilman Ecton expressed concern that approval of item number 2 would simply delay a decision that must be made. He questioned the costs of an environmental study since he felt the expense would force the city to make a decision to proceed or not. Ms. Dolan clarified that no one is going to approach the city and request an environmental study. The governing body of the city will make the next decision to proceed (or not) with an environmental study. If Council proceeded with the environmental study, the city would be in line, probably behind Glendale, for some potential Federal funding.

Councilman Silverman stressed his opinion that the city must protect the character of Scottsdale.

Ms. Korf clarified for Councilman Ecton that it is important that the city identify a corridor for rapid transit in order to be eligible for Federal funds.

**1. A Strategic Discussion of the Scottsdale Transit Plan**

**Request:** Presentation and discussion of Scottsdale's transit program, which includes a review of the updated Scottsdale Transit Plan, a master plan that supports the Community Mobility Element of the General Plan.

**Staff Contact(s):** Michelle Korf, Transportation Planning Director, (480) 312-2638, [mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us),

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA MOVED TO ACCEPT THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSIT PLAN. COUNCILWOMAN LUKAS SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED 7/0.

**2. Scottsdale/Tempe Major Investment Study**

**Request:** Recommendation to the MAG Regional Council that Scottsdale Road be designated as the locally preferred alignment for a potential future rapid transit system and reflect this change in the Scottsdale Transit Plan.

**Related Policies, References:** Scottsdale/Tempe Major Investment Study

**Staff Contact(s):** Michelle Korf, Transportation Planning Director, (480) 312-2638, [mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us)

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA MOVED TO ACCEPT THE SCOTTSDALE/TEMPE MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDY AND DESIGNATE SCOTTSDALE ROAD AS THE LOCALLY PREFERRED ALIGNMENT FOR A POTENTIAL FUTURE RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM AND REFLECT THIS CHANGE IN THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSIT PLAN. COUNCILWOMAN LUKAS SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED 4/3 (T.S., W.L., R.L.).

**3. Extension of the existing Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the City of Phoenix for bus service on eight routes serving Scottsdale.**

**Request:** Consider adoption of Resolution No. 6183 to authorize the fourth annual extension of a 5-year IGA #1999-113-COS with the City of Phoenix for the provision of bus service on eight routes. City Council authorized a 5-year agreement in 1999 subject to annual approval. This action extends the agreement through its fourth year, fiscal year 2002/03. Routes 17, 41, 50, 170, 510, 512, the Green Line, and weekend service for route 106 are covered by this agreement.

**Related Policies, References:** IGA #1999-113-COS; City Procurement Code

**Staff Contact(s):** Michelle Korf, Transportation Planning Director, (480) 312-2638; [mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us); Michael Spletter, Contract and Grant Coordinator, (480)-312-7656, [mspletter@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mspletter@ci.scottsdale.az.us)

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 6183 TO AUTHORIZE THE FORTH ANNUAL EXTENSION OF A 5-YEAR IGA #1999-113-COS WITH THE CITY OF PHOENIX FOR THE PROVISION OF BUS SERVICE ON EIGHT ROUTES. COUNCILMAN SILVERMAN SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED 7/0.

**4. Extension of the existing Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Valley Metro (formerly known as Regional Public Transportation Authority) for East Valley Dial-a-Ride service.**

**Request:** Consider adoption of Resolution No. 6182 to authorize the fourth annual extension of a 5-year IGA #1999-114-COS with Valley Metro for the provision of East Valley Dial-a-Ride paratransit services. The estimated cost of purchasing paratransit services from Valley Metro for fiscal year 2002/03 is \$947,427. City Council authorized a 5-year agreement in 1999 subject to annual approval. This action extends the agreement through fiscal year 2002/03. At present, the City continues to receive service under the existing agreement, although the IGA has not been formally re-authorized

**Related Policies, References:** IGA #1999-114-COS; City Procurement Code; Code of Federal Regulations.

**Staff Contact(s):** Michelle Korf, Transportation Planning Director, (480) 312-2638, [mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us); Michael Spletter, Contract and Grant Coordinator, (480)-312-7656, [mspletter@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mspletter@ci.scottsdale.az.us)

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 6182 TO AUTHORIZE THE FOURTH ANNUAL EXTENSION OF A 5-YEAR IGA #1999-114-COS WITH VALLEY METRO FOR THE PROVISION OF EAST VALLEY DIAL-A-RIDE PARATRANSIT SERVICES. COUNCILMAN SILVERMAN SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED 7/0.

**5. Extension of the existing Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Valley Metro (formerly the Regional Public Transportation Authority) for bus service on seven routes within the City of Scottsdale.**

**Request:** Consider adoption of Resolution No. 6184 to authorize the second annual extension of 5-year IGA #2001-146-COS with Valley Metro for the provision of transit and associated services.

**Related Policies, References:** IGA #2001-146-COS; City Procurement Code

**Staff Contact(s):** Michelle Korf, Transportation Planning Director, (480) 312-2638; [mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us); Michael Spletter, Contract and Grant Coordinator, (480)-312-7656, [mspletter@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mspletter@ci.scottsdale.az.us)

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 6184 TO AUTHORIZE THE SECOND ANNUAL EXTENSION OF 5-YEAR IGA #2001-146-COS WITH VALLEY METRO FOR THE PROVISION OF TRANSIT AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES. COUNCILMAN SILVERMAN SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED 7/0.

**6. Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) #2003-005-COS with Maricopa County for Special Transportation Services (STS) for severely disabled clients.**

**Request:** Consider adoption of Resolution No. 6228 to authorize a 1-year IGA #2003-005-COS with Maricopa County for the provision of STS. The estimated cost of purchasing these services from Maricopa County for fiscal year 2002/03 is \$19,690.

**Related Policies, References:** IGA #2003-005-COS; City Procurement Code

**Staff Contact(s):** Michelle Korf, Transportation Planning Director, (480) 312-2638; [mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mkorf@ci.scottsdale.az.us); Michael Spletter, Contract and Grant Coordinator, (480)-312-7656, [mspletter@ci.scottsdale.az.us](mailto:mspletter@ci.scottsdale.az.us)

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 6228 TO AUTHORIZE A 1-YEAR IGA #2003-005-COS WITH MARICOPA COUNTY FOR THE PROVISION OF STS. COUNCILMAN SILVERMAN SECONDED THE MOTION WHICH CARRIED 7/0.

**Public Comment - None**

**City Manager's Report - None**

**Mayor and Council Items - None**

**Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, Mayor Manross adjourned the meeting at 7:24 P.M.

**SUBMITTED BY:**

---

**Ann Eyerly, Council Recorder**

**REVIEWED BY:**

---

**Sonia Robertson, City Clerk**

## **C E R T I F I C A T E**

I hereby certify that the foregoing Minutes are a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the Special City Council Meeting of the City Council of Scottsdale, Arizona held on the 25th day of February 2003.

I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held, and that a quorum was present.

**DATED** this \_\_\_\_\_ day of February 2003.

---

**SONIA ROBERTSON**  
City Clerk